



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.				
10/522,664	08/03/2005	Heinz-Josef Lenz	064189-0604	8635				
<div>38706      7590      07/12/2007</div> <div>FOLEY &amp; LARDNER LLP</div> <div>1530 PAGE MILL ROAD</div> <div>PALO ALTO, CA 94304</div>								
<div>EXAMINER</div> <div>MYERS, CARLA J</div>								
<table border="1"><thead><tr><th>ART UNIT</th><th>PAPER NUMBER</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>1634</td><td></td></tr></tbody></table>					ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	1634	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER							
1634								
<table border="1"><thead><tr><th>MAIL DATE</th><th>DELIVERY MODE</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>07/12/2007</td><td>PAPER</td></tr></tbody></table>					MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	07/12/2007	PAPER
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE							
07/12/2007	PAPER							

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/522,664

Applicant(s)

LENZ ET AL.

Examiner

Carla Myers

Art Unit

1634

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

### **Election/Restrictions**

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claims 1-6, drawn to methods for selecting a therapeutic regimen for treating a cancer by screening for a genomic polymorphism or genotype.

Group II, claims 7-9, drawn to methods for treating neurotoxicity associated with cancer by administering a COX-2 inhibitor.

Group III, claims 10 and 11, drawn to a method for determining if a patient is more likely to experience tumor recurrence after surgical removal by assaying for the expression level of a gene.

2. The inventions listed as Groups I-III do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

A 371 case is considered to have unity of invention only when there is a technical relationship among those inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding technical features. The expression "special technical feature" means those technical features that define a contribution which each of the claimed inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art. In the instant application, the claimed inventions do not share a linking technical feature because each of the claimed methods involve the use of different reagents, have different outcomes and different effects. The methods of invention I requires detecting the presence of a polymorphism

Art Unit: 1634

and selecting a therapeutic regimen based on the presence of the polymorphism. These steps are not required to practice the method of invention II or III. The methods of invention II require treating a subject with a COX-2 inhibitor in order to accomplish the objective of reducing chemically induced neurotoxicity associated with cancer. These steps are not required to practice the method of invention I or III. The methods of invention III require assaying for the level of gene expression in order to achieve the outcome of determining if a patient is more likely to experience tumor recurrence after surgical removal of a tumor. These steps are not required to practice the method of invention I or II. As such, each of Groups I-III have a different objective and outcome and do not share the same corresponding technical feature.

Further, the technical feature of invention I was known in the art at the time the invention was made. For example, Park (International Journal Colorectal Disease. 2002. 17: 46-49; cited in the IDS) and Iacopetta (British Journal of Cancer. 2001. 85(8):827; cited in the IDS) each teach an association between polymorphisms in the thymidylate synthase gene and response to treatment to colorectal cancer. Further, regarding invention III, Shirola (Journal of Clinical Oncology. 2001. 19: 4298-4304; cited in the IDS) teaches an association between ERCC1 and thymidylate synthase mRNA levels and survival for colorectal cancer. Thus, there is no special technical feature linking the recited groups, as would be necessary to fulfill the requirement for unity of invention.

### **3. Further restriction requirement applicable to invention I**

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

- I. fluoropyrimidine
- II. platinum

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Claims 2 and 4 encompasses species I and II.

The following claim(s) are generic: claims 1, 3, 5 and 6.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: Each of the recited

Art Unit: 1634

chemotherapeutic drugs differ with respect to their chemical structure and with respect to the effect of a polymorphism on response to treatment with the drugs.

#### **4. Further restriction requirement applicable to invention I**

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

- I. esophageal cancer
- II. gastric cancer
- III. colon cancer / colorectal cancer
- IV. rectal cancer
- V. lung cancer

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Art Unit: 1634

Claim 3 encompasses species I-V.

The following claim(s) are generic: claims 1, 2, and 4-6

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: Each of the recited diseases differ from one another with respect to their causes and effects and each disease is associated with distinct responses to treatment, and have a different association between a polymorphism and response to treatment.

**5. Further restriction requirement applicable to invention I**

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

I. thymidylate synthase

II. ERCC1

III. VEGF

IV. ERC1

V. XRCC-1

VI. human glutathione s-transferase P1

VII. epidermal growth factor receptor gene

VIII. matrix metalloproteinase gene –1

IX. matrix metalloproteinase gene –3

Art Unit: 1634

X. IL-8

XI. DPD

XII. CXC chemokine

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Claims 5 encompasses each of the species I-XII  
Claim 6 encompasses species I, II, and III.

The following claim(s) are generic: claims 1-4.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The recited genes differ from one another with respect to their nucleotide structure and the proteins that they encode. The genes thereby have a different chemical structure and different biological activity. Thus, the claimed genes do not have both a "common property or



Art Unit: 1634

activity" and a common structure as would be required to show that the inventions are "of a similar nature."

**6. Further restriction requirement applicable to invention II**

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

I. oxaliplatin

II. 5-FU

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Claim 8 encompasses species I; Claim 9 encompasses species II.

The following claim(s) are generic: claim 7.

Art Unit: 1634

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: Each of the recited chemotherapeutic drugs differ with respect to their chemical structure and with respect to their functional and biological activities. Thus, the claimed drugs do not have both a common structure and a "common property or activity" as would be required to show that the inventions are "of a similar nature."

#### **7. Further restriction requirement applicable to invention III**

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

I. thymidylate synthase

II. DPD

III. ERCC1

IV. VEGF

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Claims 10 and II encompass each of the species I-IV

No claims are generic.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The recited genes differ from one another with respect to their nucleotide structure and the proteins that they encode. The genes thereby have a different chemical structure and different biological activity. Thus, the claimed genes do not have both a "common property or activity" and a common structure as would be required to show that the inventions are "of a similar nature."

8. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not

Art Unit: 1634

distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

9. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carla Myers whose telephone number is (571) 272-0747. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30 AM-5:00 PM. A message may be left on the examiner's voice mail service. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ram Shukla, can be reached on (571)-272-0735.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1634

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at (866)-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Carla Myers/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1634